

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NOV 27 2006

REMARKS**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 13-41 and 52-54 were examined in the application. Claims 14 and 54 have been canceled and new claims 55 and 56 have been added to the application.

Claims 13-14, 22, 25-26 and 52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,956,487 granted to Venkatraman et al. ("Venkatraman").

Claims 15-16, 18-20, 27-35, 37, 39-41, 53, and 54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venkatraman in view of the U.S. Patent No. 6,587,125 granted to Paroz ("Paroz").

Claims 21 and 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Venkatraman in view of Paroz and in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0217360 filed by Gordon et al. ("Gordon").

Response to Rejections

All of the claim rejections rely on the disclosure of Venkatraman, either alone or in combination with other references. The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections for the reasons given in the Remarks filed with the response of February 24, 2006. These Remarks are incorporated herein by reference. However, to advance the prosecution of the application, the Applicant has further amended each of the independent claims. The Applicant believes that these amendments place the claims in a condition for allowance and requests reconsideration of the application.

The amendments to the claims relate to one of two features enabled by the specification that are not disclosed in Venkatraman. First, Venkatraman does not teach asynchronous operation of the media device. That is, the system of Venkatraman requires a live network connection between the user and the device the user is attempting to control. The specification of the present application enables a system in which such a live connection is not required. Second, Venkatraman does not teach the use of a remote server that operates more than one media device. The specification of the present application enables a system in which a single remote server can be used for the operation of multiple media devices.

Claims 13, 52, and 55 each recite that commands received as a result of user input are stored in a "transaction file," and this transaction file is sent to the media device through a request by the media device. (See paragraphs [0153]-[0157] of the pending specification for a discussion of transaction files.) This type of operation does away with Venkatraman's requirement of a live connection between the user and the media device. Instead, a user may provide instructions for the operation of the media device at a time convenient to the user (e.g., while the user has an Internet connection), while the media device may update its instructions by requesting the transaction file at a time convenient to the media device. (For example, the media device may request the transaction file periodically, or at a time when it has available processing and/or communications resources.) Similarly, claims 27 and 53 recite that user input is stored in a "local representation," and that the commands relating to this local representation are provided to the media device on the request of the media device. As a result, claims 13, 27, 52, 53, and 55 (and the claims dependent therefrom) all

recite a system capable of operating, unlike Venkatraman, in an asynchronous mode, and all are believed to be in a condition for allowance.

New claim 56 expressly recites that a second media device is controlled through the same user interface as a first media device. That is, claim 56 recites a method in which more than one device is controlled through the same web-hosted user interface. Venkatraman, on the other hand, requires that a single web server be provided for (and incorporated into) each device. Each server of Venkatraman is associated with only one device. Indeed, to operate multiple devices over a network in the scheme of Venkatraman, each device is provided with its own server. (See Figs. 2, 4 and accompanying text.) Claim 56, then, recites a method that is not taught by Venkatraman or the remaining prior art of record and is believed for this additional reason to be in a condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

The Applicant submits that the application is in a condition for allowance and respectfully requests further examination and allowance of the pending claims. If, in the opinion of the Office, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Office is invited to call the undersigned attorney, at 312-913-2115.

Respectfully submitted,

McDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP

November 27, 2006

By: 

Jeffrey A. Steck

Registration No. 40,184